

REMARKS

In response to the aforementioned Office letter and initially, the applicants have deleted the claim to priority. The applicants  
5 are prepared to rely upon the filing date of this present application.

The applicants also note the objection to claims in the application under 35 U.S.C. 112. In particular, the Examiner rejected Claim 1 and related claims on the grounds that the language  
10 "while advancing toward an end of the line position so that they may reach a destination in advance of that end of the line position" was confusing. The Examiner did note that the end of the line would parenthetically constitute the front of the line. Nevertheless, the claims did not state that it is a front or rear end of the line.  
15 However, with language now present in the claims to the effect that there is a direction of movement and pedestrian individuals are walking in that direction of movement, they would inherently reach the front end of the line. It is, therefore, believed that there should be no inconsistency in the claims and that the claims are not  
20 confusing.

The Examiner also contended that this language would be confusing with the preamble. Reconsideration is respectfully urged. The preamble merely states that the pedestrian individuals are advancing toward an end of the line position so that they may reach  
25 a destination in advance of that end of the line position. The

claims merely state that the end of the line position may represent a waiting location so that the individuals may reach the end of the line position and thereafter proceed to the destination. In effect, this is exactly what happens. For example, in a bank the customers may wait in a line and the party at the front end of the line will then proceed to the destination as, for example, a cashier or a teller, who is located in advance of that end of the line position. It is believed that these claims are therefore clear and not inconsistent.

This amendment is also being submitted in response to an interview with Examiner Alexander Smith and Supervisory Examiner Diego Guiterrez on February 19, 2004. The courtesy of that interview is greatly appreciated. At the aforesaid interview, the applicants discussed the claims in the application as well as related applications of the same applicants including, for example, application Serial No. 10/004,213.

In that interview, the Examiner and Supervisory Examiner argued that one of the principal elements of the claims is the fact that the footprints function as movement indicator elements and point out a direction of movement. Both Examiners believed that these elements were not obvious in view of the prior art, in combination with the other elements now present in the claims. It was also suggested that if these elements were incorporated in the claims, they could potentially place the claims in condition for allowance.

The applicants have amended all of the claims in the application to define these limitations. Each of the article claims in the application have been amended to define the plurality of movement indicator elements on the pathways to suggest the individuals in the line walk in the pedestrian pathway and, moreover, not only do they suggest a walking activity, but they also suggest the direction of movement. The movement indicator elements, preferably in the form of footprints, cooperate with the path forming elements to present the desired pathway and direction of movement to an end of the line position.

It is respectfully urged that the arguments previously presented by the applicants regarding allowance of the claims are valid and the claims are believed to be allowable without these new limitations. Nevertheless, the applicants have amended all of the claims to include these limitations. It is therefore believed that each of these claims is therefore allowable and allowance therefore is respectfully solicited.


Prior to the interview, the claims in the application were rejected as being unpatentable over Hennsler et al. in view of the Chien and Gehweiler Patents. These patents have been discussed at length in the present application and they have been discussed in applicants' related pending U.S. patent applications. At the outset, it is imperative to note that each of the prior art references cited by the Examiner, including the three upon which reliance is made in this application, do not show a guidance and

location control system with an end of the line element defining a waiting position for movement to a destination in advance of that position, as well as guidance elements forming a desired pathway. The Examiners at the interview courteously suggested that the claims would be much stronger and more accurately define over the prior art with inclusion of language directed to the movement indicator elements, such as the footprints, defining the direction of movement. This language has been incorporated in each and every claim in the application and it is therefore believed that the claims now patentably distinguish over the prior art.

It is believed that the applicant has overcome all of the objections raised by the Examiner and therefore, based on the aforesaid interview, this application should be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance is therefore respectfully solicited.

Dated: July 16, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

  
ROBERT J. SCHAAP  
Registration No. 20,577  
Attorney for Applicant  
(818) 346-6555

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted  
by electronic mail to the United States Patent and Trademark Office  
on July 15, 2004.

Sarah Thrift Date of Signature: July 15, 2004  
Sarah Thrift

C:\Documents and Settings\All Users\Documents\Data\Pharo\10633480Cont App Based on 213\Amendment B